

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on 11/03/2010 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). Claims 5-11 and 14-21 were indicated to contain allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is thanked for the same.

By virtue of this paper, claims 1, 6-9, 12-13, 15-16 and 21 are sought to be amended and claims 2-5 and 14 are sought to be canceled. The amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendments are believed not to introduce new matter and their entry is requested. Claims 1, 6-13 and 15-21 are thus presented for reconsideration further in view of the below remarks.

### *Communication with Examiner*

The Examiner was sent a copy of the proposed response and it was indicated that the response appears to be fully responsive to the Outstanding Office Action. The applicant is believed to have met any burden of making of record the Substance of the Interview. See MPEP 713.04 for further clarification.

### *Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)*

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging and making of record the IDS filed on 05 May 2006.

### *Specification*

In page 2, paragraph 1 of the Outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to stating:

On page 3, lines 10-12, "the first module may further send an address ..., wherein the data is sent.... in the data transfer phase" is apparently confusing in that sending an address in an address transfer phase apparently should be described in place of sending data in a data transfer phase, which would also consistent with the first paragraph of the overview.

In response, the corresponding paragraph 0023 is sought to be amended to clarify that **the same first module** (which has earlier sent the address to the second module) also sends the data bits to the second module in the data transfer phase.

Withdrawal of the objection with respect to the specification is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating:

5        In claim 1: "using a first set of signal lines" is  
considered vague in the context of the detailed disclosure  
and apparently should be "using all of a first set of  
signal lines"; "using said first set of signal lines" is  
10       considered vague in the context of the detailed disclosure  
and apparently should be "using all of said first set of  
signal lines".

Claim 1 is sought to be amended accordingly. Withdrawal of the rejection as against  
claim 1 is respectfully requested.

15       Claim 3 was also rejected based on 35 U.S.C. § 112. The rejection is rendered moot in  
view of the cancellation of the corresponding claim.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating:

20       In claim 13: "wherein said first module requests  
access to transmit data on said message bus using said  
first signal line and transmits a bit of each of a  
plurality of packets on said first signal line" is  
ambiguous in that it's not clear whether it is "data"  
25       transmitting that will be "using said first signal line" or  
it is the "access to transmit" request that will be "using  
said first signal line." The disclosure and the other  
independent claim seem to imply the latter possible  
30       interpretation, however both possible interpretations are  
apparently consistent with the disclosure. The examiner  
presumes here that latter interpretation is intended, and  
accordingly the above-cited passage apparently should read  
as "wherein said first module uses said first signal line  
35       to request access to transmit data on said message bus and  
also transmits a bit of each of a plurality of packets on  
said first signal line" or the like, to remove the  
ambiguity.

In response, claim 13 is sought to be amended to clarify that the first signal line is used by  
40       the first module to both request access to the message bus and also to transmit a bit of the  
packets.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as against claim 13 is respectfully

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating:

Claim 21 is sought to be amended accordingly. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Independent claim 1 is sought to be amended to include all the features of claim 5 and the intervening claims. It is accordingly believed that currently amended claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

All the independent claims are thus in condition for allowance. The dependent claims are also in condition for allowance as overcoming all the rejections/objections of record and depending from an allowable base claim.

Thus, all the objections and rejections are believed to be overcome and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned

representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra R Thappeta/  
Signature

Date: January 24, 2011

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration Number: 41,416